

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, I want, first of all, to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM]. He is a genuine American hero. Those were great remarks. Absolutely truthful, absolutely right on the money, right on the mark, cutting through the, well, I cannot say that, just cutting through it all. And really telling it exactly like it is. Maybe a lot of people are in mourning tonight because they feel like they have been betrayed by this Congress because the American public understands that term limits is the cornerstone of congressional reform. The public understands that.

But do not be in mourning. Do not be in mourning. There is no reason to, because really, this is a situation of pay me now or pay me later. Vote for term limits tonight or your replacement will vote for term limits in 2 years.

That is exactly what goes on here. What you are going to have tonight or what we have seen tonight is with the defeat of this bill, we are going to see a ton of replacements in two years.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. It has been very interesting to listen to the debate, and I would associate myself in full with the remarks of the gentleman from California who preceded you in the well.

But, Madam Speaker, it was very interesting earlier tonight to hear one of our friends on the other side talk about the ship Contract with America listing and creaking and the bow breaking and all these terrible things. Amazingly, and undoubtedly since so many members of the media in this town work in complicity with those on the left, I just think they have missed the story.

The fact is that we pledged to bring 10 items to the floor for an up or down vote. And even though there is disappointment tonight, as my friend from Ohio mentions, the fact is there is cause for jubilation because now we have enjoined the dialogue. And coming from a State in which the major city is named Phoenix, I assure the American people tonight, Madam Speaker, that this issue will again rise from the ashes.

Mr. HOKE. Let us look at the numbers on this. The fact is the Republicans voted 189 yes, 40 no. That is about 82, 83 percent of the Republican Conference voted in favor of term limits. On the other hand, Democrats voted 38 yes, 163 no; 80 percent of the Democrat Caucus voted against term limits. Who defeated term limits? Democrats defeated term limits.

Who is going to be defeated in November of 1996? Well, the public will decide. The public will decide. But what I would urge, right out there tonight, there are people who should be stirred. There are men and women who have thought, I want to serve my country, I have something to offer. I have wanted

to do this for some time, but I have not had the courage, the motivation, the specific interest, the specific initiative to do this. Doggone it, there are 22 States out there that have already enacted term limits. Or is it 24? Twenty-two?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Twenty-two.

Mr. HOKE. Twenty-two States have enacted term limits; 24 million people in this country have voted for them. They have carried by a margin of 70 to 80 percent in every single one of those States. In each of those 22 States, there are men and women who ought to use this as their issue, because if your representative voted against term limits in one of those 22 States, that representative is saying, I know better than the people. I do not care what the people say. I do not care that 70 or 80 percent of the people demand that we have limited terms. I do not care that the public understands that this truly is the cornerstone of congressional reform, that this is the way that we are going to eliminate congressional careerism forever.

I do not care because I know better. And I know better because, gosh, after all, I have been here 20, 30, 40 years. How else would I not know better?

Those people should be inspired tonight and they should grab this and take this opportunity and get involved. And this is your campaign issue for November 1996.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio has noted, as many of us have, during the course of these first 100 days, that indeed many folks who walk to the chamber in fact become walking advertisements for term limits, walking examples of the reasons why we should enact them.

Let me pause here to make a distinction because I also want to point out that good people can disagree and no doubt others will follow us in the chamber, making distinctions of conscience, of conviction, but we abhor the gamesmanship that was played during the course of this debate, really spurning the notion of what the will of the people might be.

MORE ON TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Madam Speaker, I think sometimes it is appropriate, again, to reflect a little bit on history. I happened to be sitting in the well this evening and looking up to the ceiling. Just behind the speaker's platform and above the clock is a saying on the wall and it is a very appropriate quote. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Those words were uttered by Daniel Webster, a former member of this body and a former member of the United States Senate.

Intrigued by that, I happened to check his biography and noted that he served in both the House and the Senate, that he first served in the House for 4 years, was defeated, took 6 years in the private sector, ran again for the House, this time from another State. Initially he had been in New Hampshire, moved to Massachusetts, and then switched, ran for the Senate, served 14 years, resigned, spent 4 more years in the private sector and ended his career in the Senate with a term of 4 years before he resigned in, I believe, 1851 or 1852.

I mention that because there has been a lot that has changed in this country since men of the caliber of Daniel Webster served here. Let us hope that the actions that we take today and in the future will encourage more men and women of his caliber to serve in this body.

But I was very torn today on the issue of term limits. As many may know, my State enacted a referendum in the fall of 1994 imposing a 6-year limit, which I intend to honor, and which I believe is binding on representatives from the State of Maine. But given the fact that we were presented with a bill tonight on the floor that did not provide me with the required degree of certainty that it would not preempt State law, I voted against the bill and I did so reluctantly. But I want to add a message because it would be inappropriate to say that the debate has taken place entirely on this floor. Because I think the debate has taken place across the country in all 50 States and in the thousands of communities that make up this great land.

I think the people are speaking very loudly and clearly that they want some form of system that will guarantee that the lack of professionalism in the sense of people making a lifetime career out of service in this body, and we have seen enough information about the longevity of service, I think an average of some 25 or 30 years, particularly for committee chairs, and extended service by others well past their prime of life and well past their ability to display the type of sensitivity to the private sector that we would like to see displayed by representatives in this body. And so I call upon the three groups that have been active across the country, the groups supporting the 6-year term limit, the group supporting the 8-year limit, and the group supporting the 12-year limit, to get together and, in the words of our speaker, be prepared to support H.R. 1 on the first day of the next session that will somehow or other find a way to respect the difference in the diversity among the 50 States and provide for a term-limit because that will allow us to have once and for all one standard that we can apply in this country and not

confront representatives such as myself with a very difficult dilemma where we are being asked to support a concept that we believe in very deeply but, yet, which we find at odds with the laws of our own State.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to serve in this body.

ANOTHER VIEW ON TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, I rise as one who voted against the term-limit limitations, because as I have heard the arguments tonight, it is not how many terms you have, it is what you do with the term, the term, the one term at a time. It is what you do with that term and then it is what the voters think that you have done with that term and how they feel about that term that determines or should determine whether or not you return.

In the case of my State, West Virginia, we are a small state. We have three House Members. Other States have far bigger delegations. I think that my State would be, the majority of my State would say, why is it that we should be limited as to whether or not we can vote for ROBERT C. BYRD, for instance, and the distinguished service that he has had? Why is it that we should be limited in whether or not we can vote for other leaders who may rise and show themselves to be able?

In the case of a small State like West Virginia, with three House Members, please remember that when you have term limits what you are going to do is to turn this place over to the large States. And so the Californias, the Floridas, the Texasas will dominate every 2 years who it is that becomes chairs and subcommittee chairs and ranking Members.

So small States have a vested interest in making sure that there is some kind of equality here so that we have an equal say as well. There are many here who say, term limits, we will really rein in the Members on this thing. Nobody ever talks about the staff. Nobody limited the staff. Nobody limited the lobbyists. Nobody limited the others that all are part of this mix called democracy and called a legislative body.

So what happens is then the institutional memory now resides entirely with those who are truly the paid professionals here. I do not say that disparagingly of them, except just to make that observation that those people who become the ranking members and subcommittee chairs and the chairs will have less and less to say about what actually happens in their committees.

□ 2215

I would also like for people to think for a second, what is it that everyone is to be ashamed about for having some

kind of experience, particularly if that experience has been reinforced every 2 years in something wonderful called an election? I refuse to be ashamed for the fact that I have developed more experience, and feel that I am a more able representative of my constituency, but knowing all the time that my constituency decides every 2 years whether or not that is the kind of experience they want, or whether I am exercising that properly, or in what they think is a proper format.

Does anyone around here ever walk into a law office, a physician's office, or any there office, into a store, and say "Hey, could I have the most junior person around here? I want the one who just got here, the one who just got out of medical school, the one who just got their certification. Please, I want to skip over the most senior person. I don't want to get to somebody who has had even maybe 13 years, of course not."

What is it that is supposedly bad about experience if the voters are truly exercising their control? That gets to a very important point, Madam Speaker, that what we are talking about here is the frustration that is very real in our country about whether or not Congress is responding. That frustration needs to be dealt with in campaign finance reform.

It would be my hope that H.R. 1 would not be a term-limit bill. Actually, let us hope there does not need to be a campaign finance reform bill in 1997, because I would like to see it out on the floor in 1995. That, I think, limiting the amounts of money, curbing the money chase, making it easier for challengers to take on incumbents, that is real term limitation.

Somebody pointed out that 90 percent of incumbents, 91 percent, were re-elected last time, but what they did not point out was that so many chose not to run because they saw the odds, they read the polls, they talked to their constituents. The fact of the matter is that over half this Congress, 219 Members, have been here 5 years or less. Almost one-half has been renewed in just the last two elections, the last 4 years.

Madam Speaker, I think those are important statistics. The average lifespan, political lifespan of a Member of Congress in the House is less than 12 years, that very term, that very limitation which many would seek to impose.

Madam Speaker, for all those reasons I happen to think that term limits is one of those bumper sticker phrases which sounds good, but which in reality does not further our democracy.

I think our voters, in West Virginia our voters do not need term limits. I would point out that in our State, for instance, over half of the House of Delegates, on any given election 40 to 50 percent of our House of Delegates is changed. Indeed, many members of our State Senate this year were changed. Our voters know how to judge people

and how to limit terms on their own, and that is through a process, a wonderful process called an election.

A HISTORIC NIGHT WITH VOTES ON TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, rather than to try to make a speech, I just have a few minutes of reflection on what I think happened tonight and what is going to happen in the future.

It is a historic night. The Contract With America said we would allow votes on term limits, and we did. Now it is up to the public to see who voted and how they voted on all the votes. If you really want term limits, you are going to have to act on what the body did tonight. If you think there is some correcting that needs to be done, it is up to you to do it.

I can assure you this, after having been here almost 100 days, that this body is not going to give in to the will of the people easily. There is plenty of blame to go around, and the numbers speak for themselves. Eighty percent of the Democratic Party voted against final passage on this bill. Eighty percent of the Republican Party voted for final passage. Those are pretty compelling numbers. However, to be honest, Mr. Speaker, there is shared blame here. The Republican Party needs to push term limits harder, from the bottom and the top. My class, 73 Republican freshmen, about 90, 95 percent of us believe in term limits and believe in it deeply. I admire people who disagree with me who have equally strong beliefs, and they do exist, but what we have to do as a party is to get more focused and make sure the bill does not get messed up in committee and have to explain our positions here and get off track.

I think we will learn something from tonight, that we will be more focused next year, and when the vote comes in the first part of the 105th Congress, that we will be more focused as a party and we will really, really push for term limits.

The good news is that people have voted, they are sort of out in the public's eye now, and you can determine who is with you and who is against you. The bad news is that the people who are not members of a term limits organization, and I do feel sorry for those people who are Members of term limits organizations that have worked so hard to get their message across, that it fell short, but the average, everyday citizen who is not a member of anything, other than maybe their church, who is trying to raise their kids, trying to make it through life, we let them down. That is what really bothers me the most.